

## LIST C.

Time required to complete the new Project.

1	Harangi Project.	...	Five years.
2	Upper-Krishna Project—Stage-I.	...	Seven years.
3	Malaprabha Project.	...	Six years.
4	Hemavathy Project.	...	Five years.
5	Kambadakada Project.	...	Four years.
6	Harinala Project.	...	Three years.
7	Bijjur Reservoir Project.	...	Five years.

**Allocation of Revised Pay Scales to the Teachers working in old District Board Schools and Government Schools in Bellary District.**

\*Q.—229. Sri C. M. REVANA-SIDDAIAH (Siruguppa).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

the action taken by the Government to sanction increments and allocation to teachers working in old District Board Schools and Government Schools of Bellary District as per 1956 and 1961 revised pay scales?

A.—Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—

(1) Increments and allocations as per the revised scales of 1957 and 1961 have been sanctioned in respect of teachers working in Government Schools.

(2) Regarding the teachers working in the Ex-District Board Schools, the allocations in respect of the revised scales of pay of 1957 have been sanctioned. So far as the 1961 revised pay scales are concerned, the matter is being expedited.

**Construction of a Pick-up on the Shimsha River near Iggalur in Channapatna Taluk.**

\*Q.—577. Sri SHIVALINGE GOWDA (Virupakshipura).—

(a) whether it has come to their notice that survey has been made to

construct a pick-up on the Shimsha river near Iggalur in Channapatna Taluk;

(b) whether they propose to sanction the same?

A.—Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation).—

(a) No.

(b) This does not arise in view of reply to clause (a).

2-00 P.M.

**REPORT OF THE RESOURCES AND ECONOMY COMMITTEE.**

(Motion to consider)

(Debate Continued)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, let me know how many members want to participate in the debate today?

*Many members rose.*

Mr. SPEAKER.—I find there are a large number of persons desirous of participating in the debate. It would be but proper that we should give them a chance. I want to extend the period by one day more.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—If you want, I will not come in the way.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—If the Hon'ble Members are interested in taking part in the debate and want to make better suggestions, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The discussion will take the whole of today and tomorrow and the reply of the Minister also will be over tomorrow.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ (ಭಾಲ್ಕಿ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮೂಲೋತ್ಪಾದನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನಂತರ ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆಯುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಹಿಂದೆ 1961ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ರಚಿಸಿದ್ದ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಶಿಫಾರಸುಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಪಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ವರದಿಯ ವಿಚಾರವೂ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಹಾಗಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಶಂಕೆಯಿದೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲಿದೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಭಾಗ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಭಾಗ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೀಸಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಬರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಉಳಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದು, ಮೂರನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗಾಗಿ ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ 42 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣ ಮಾಡುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ಭಾಗ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಎರಲ್ವಿ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಯಾವಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿನಿಂದ ಪಡೆದು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಒಡಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದು. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನೊಂದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಪಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಕೊರತೆಯಿದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡಕ್ಕೂ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಅವಲಂಬನೆಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಎರಡರ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೂ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಈಗ ಆಡಳಿತದ ಬರ್ಚಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬರೀ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಹಣ ಕೂಡಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕೆಲವು ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು ಒಂದು ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯ 41 ಮತ್ತು 42ನೆಯ ಪುಟಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪವಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ವರದಿನಗಳನ್ನೇನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉಳಿದಿವೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ, ಲಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಶಂಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಎರಡು ಭಾಗಗಳಿಗೂ ಲಕ್ಷಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗುವುದು. ಈಗ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನ್ನ ಮನಬಂದಂತೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಲು ಹೊರಟಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 2-3 ಸಲ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದ ವಿಚಾರ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದು ಮೊದಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ನಂತರ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದರೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬೇಜಾರು ಬಂದೀತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಎಧಿಸಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 1952 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಹಗೀರಿ ವಜಾ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಅಸೆಸಮೆಂಟ್ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇತ್ತು. ಒಂದು ಕಾಲ್ಕು, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಜಹಗೀರಿ. ಕಾಲ್ಕು ನಿಜಾಮರ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲಿನಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು; ಜಹಗೀರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಹುಕುಮತು ಇತ್ತು. ಎಕರೆಗೆ 20 ಅಥವಾ 25 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಅಸೆಸಮೆಂಟ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಗುಲ್ಬರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಂದಿತು. ಕಾಲ್ಕು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ,

ಶೇಕಡ 50 ಭಾಗ ಸಸಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಆದರಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಇವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೆ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಎನೂ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಸರಿಮಾಡಲು ರೀಸೆಟ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ನಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು? ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿದೆ. ಲಂಚದ ದೆಶೆಯಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗರಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 1950 ರ ನಂತರ 1955 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂತ್ ವಜಾ ಆದಾಗ 5, 6, 12 ಮತ್ತು 13 ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಅದರಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತ ರಷ್ಟು, ನಲವತ್ತ ರಷ್ಟು, ಅರವತ್ತ ರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ; ಉಪನಿವರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಕ್ಕೂದಾಲಖಾನ್ ರವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದಾಗ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು; ಶ್ರೀ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ತಿಂಗಳು ಬದರೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗಲೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆವು. ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ, 4 ಸಾವಿರ, 8 ಸಾವಿರ, 10 ಸಾವಿರ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದೇನಿದೆ ಅದರ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸಪ್ತೆಷ್ಚ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾರ್ಗವಿಲ್ಲ. 1955ರಿಂದ ಇನಾಂ ಅಬಾಲಿಷ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಆದಾಗಿನಿಂದ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದ್ವಿಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ದಿಸ್ತ್ರಿಕ್ಟುಗಳ ರೀಲರ್ಗನ್ಯುಜೇಷನ್ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಬದರೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿ, ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ-ಇವುಗಳ ರೀತಿಯೇ ಬೇರೆ. ನಮ್ಮದೇ ಒಂದು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆದು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯದೇ ಒಂದು ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ಮಹತ್ವವಿದೆ; ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯ, ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿದೆ. ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು 22 ಅಥವಾ 23 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈಗ ಇರುವ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಡಿವಿಜನ್ಗಳು, 19 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು 171 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳನ್ನು 3 ಡಿವಿಜನ್ಗಳು, 15 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು 120 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ 19 ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಿವೆ, ಅವುಗಳ ಹೈಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿದ್ದು ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ, ಹೆಚ್ಚಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಯಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಬದರೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನು ಬದರಾಯಿಸಬಾರದು. ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು, ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರವನ್ನು ಬದರಾಯಿಸಬಾರದು.

ಬೇರೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿವೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ

ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಸೂದೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ Agricultural Income tax Amendment Bill ಇದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ವರಮಾನ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ರ‍್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಸಿಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ, ಮದರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಸೇಕಡ 25ರಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಇಂಕಮ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಸಾಕು. ಈ ವಾದಿಯು 546ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ (1) "There is no surcharge on land revenue. A special levy on certain cash crops such as sugarcane, cotton, etc., is under contemplation. This is expected to yield Rs. 3 crores in 5 years."

(2) The entire Land Revenue is proposed to be turned over to the Local Bodies.

ಅಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

"Agricultural Income tax, which was in force in the Telangana Area prior to State Reorganisation, has been abolished. Andhra area had no Agricultural Income tax. There is no levy of Agricultural Income tax now and no proposal to introduce it."

ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಇದೆ, ಈಗ ಹೆರಾನ್ಸ್ 9 ಪರ್‌ಸೆಂಟ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಟ್ಟಡದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು, ಎಂದರೆ, ಅಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಇಂಕಮ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ, "Revenue settlement work has been abandoned. In lieu of it a surcharge of 12½ percent was levied. This has now been made over to Local Bodies. The supercharge on Land Assessment has been done away with the passing of the Agricultural Income Tax Act, 1958" ಅಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲೇನಿವೆ ಅದೇ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಮೆ ಇದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರೆ ತನ್ನ, ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಎಳೆದರೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri A. P. APPANNA (Virajpet).—Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my comments on the report of the Mysore Resources and Economy Committee. While offering my comments, I must say that as legislators we must first consider the views of the committee regarding the economy measures

suggested for the Legislature itself, I feel before we suggest certain economies in other departments, it is better that we set an example in accepting the suggestions made by the committee in respect of the legislature. In the report I find that necessary co-operation and assistance have not been given by the legislature when the committee wanted to know the suggestions from this side. In the report on page 140 it is said:

"Data of expenditure incurred for the State Legislature and on the staff of the Legislature Secretariat, was invited from the Secretary, Legislature but was not furnished to us. We could not also, have the benefit of the Secretary's views in regard to possible economy in expenditure, as the several dates fixed up for discussion with him did not suit his convenience."

As an example we ought to have co-operated in suggesting economy before we dictate any other departments in effecting the measures suggested by the committee.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is this department going to dictate any other department? Has it got such a power? I see there is no such power.

SRI B. D. JATTI.—Sir, he means legislators; they are suggesting to other departments to cut down any expenditure whereas the Legislature Department did not co-operate.

SRI A. P. APPANNA.—In the report regarding the legislature, the Committee has with the limited data and facts that were available to it, have suggested certain measures. We find that we as members often grumble that we are not provided with various facilities in the Legislators' Home. In the report we find the committee saying as:

"There is in our opinion, considerable scope for reduction in the scale of amenities provided at the Legislators' Home and in the expenditure on hire of equipment, furniture, conveyances, etc."

May be, by effecting this economy, we may be able to save very little. But as an example, we must be prepared to accept it. As an example to the other

(SRI A. P. APPANNA)

departments and as an example to the people at large, we must be prepared to accept this recommendation of the Committee. Then, we can be bold enough to talk regarding the other economies in the Government.

There is an observation made regarding expenditure on Ministers and also number of Ministers. We have to look into this matter. In the report, it is suggested that only eight Ministers are sufficient to run this Government. If that is so, we have to look into it seriously. We have to take the example of the Government of Madras. I feel it is possible to run the Government with the number of Ministers suggested in this report. The Committee has observed regarding the touring expenses of the Ministers. I find that some of the tours undertaken by the Ministers are not at all, I mean, useful for the purposes of administration. As far as possible it is better that the Ministers confine themselves to the policy making matters rather than touring and interfering with small matters, which will cost the Exchequer as well as to a certain extent embarrass the officials.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Electricity).—Does the Hon'ble Member suggest that after laying down the policies, the Ministers and Deputy Ministers should not look to the implementation even to the minutest detail?

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—I did not say that they should not travel. They must travel in order to have contact with the people and to know the grievances of the people. But the tours that are undertaken frequently, I feel, are not necessary. The Committee has suggested various methods to cut down expenditure in this State.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—If the Hon'ble Member yields;—does the Hon'ble Member support the suggestion of this Committee that the strength of the Cabinet should be reduced?

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—Whether I am a member on this side or a member on the other side, I have got a right to

suggest any of the recommendations. I have got a right to recommend any of the recommendations to the Government for a decision on the same.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—He is suggesting various economy measures—whether it is possible to reduce the expenditure without allowing the efficiency to suffer. He is making his suggestions.

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—Sir, this report is an elaborate one. I will confine myself to those recommendations which I have gone through thoroughly and leave other things to the other Hon'ble Members who will comment on them.

Regarding this Secretariat, I find according to the report of the Committee, that there is a lot of scope for economy. This is a matter we have to look into seriously and there must be some drastic measures taken to curtail the number of officials in the Secretariat and also to see that papers are moved quickly. Some of the observations made by the Committee are really very startling and unless we think seriously in this matter and if this state of affairs continues, we feel that it will be very difficult for us to run the Government efficiently. Unless the papers move quickly, unless this red-tapism is removed, it will be very difficult to see that the administration is carried on efficiently. Some may feel that delay in moving papers may not cause any injustice. But if we take certain observations made, if a proposal is sent and if it is to be taken into effect immediately and if the Government drop the proposal after "562 days", then we feel that any proposal that may be sent to the Government may either be accepted after two years or dropped after two years. Sometimes, it so happens that a proposal is sent with the main object of implementing it as quickly as possible. But after two years lapse, the very purpose of implementing that proposal will be lost. Hence, if delay is caused in the Secretariat, then we feel that a lot of injustice will be caused in the administration in various matters. Sir, the first thing that the Government can think of is reducing the staff in the Secretariat.



Then, Sir, I find a comment in the report regarding transfers. It has been found that frequent transfers have caused a lot of inconvenience in the execution of various works at various stages in the district level. Sir, I would draw the attention of the Chair to page 98, where it is stated :

“Want of rational transfer policy is responsible to much avoidable expenditure and dislocation of work in Government departments. Frequent transfers of clerks and subordinate officials are among the causes of low official morale. But this is not confined to low-paid staff alone. We were astonished to be told during our recent visit to Karwar that, in the last 14 years since Independence, there were 18 postings of the Deputy Commissioners to that district, and that of them, one held the post for 11 days.”

Sir, in the districts—say an official from Karwar is transferred to Coorg; what happens? A district commissioner will take at least six months to understand the problem, to understand the existing conditions in a particular district. After knowing all those things, he is transferred elsewhere and another man is posted. So, every deputy commissioner who is posted to a district will be knowing the problem only and not solving the problem.

*(Interruptions.)*

Only, he is benefited and he does not give the benefit to the people. It has been the experience in our district also, where there have been frequent transfers. In Coorg district, there are certain peculiar land tenures under the existing Act, and peculiar conditions. The deputy commissioners transferred to Coorg take a lot of time in knowing the problems and conditions. After they come to know those problems, they are transferred elsewhere. Sir, it is better that the Government insist that every deputy commissioner must be transferred only after he serves for a particular period in a particular district.

2-30 P.M.

Sir, it is also said in the Report that transfers of lower officials from one district to another district has caused lot of hardship and dissatisfaction among the officials. A Clerk who is drawing about Rs. 100 if he is transferred from South Kanara district some where in Karwar or Raichur, imagine what hardship is caused to him and what sort of dislocation for his family and children, who are studying in a particular place. These things go to show that particular employee is dissatisfied and he is not in a position to discharge his duties efficiently.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Suppose his services are required elsewhere.

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—Sir, there may be special circumstances where certain officials, whose services are required, have to be transferred. But in the case of I-Division and II-Division Clerks, I feel, the duties are one and the same in all the Districts. So I don't think it will be very necessary to transfer a I-Division Clerk from one corner of the State to another corner, and it will be possible to find a particular man within the District and also it is necessary that these Clerks and lower officials are retained in their own districts because they know the conditions and circumstances that are prevailing in their districts. In page 99 of the Report it is suggested that “Transfers of officials below the grade of Tahsildars, or equivalent post in other Government departments, should be restricted to other District.” There is much weight in this recommendation, because a lower official will be in a position to enlighten and bring to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner or other equivalent authorities in the District, who will be constantly moving from District to District. It is the lower official who brings the local conditions and problems to the notice of the District authorities. Hence, it is but necessary that these transfers must prevail within the District and not outside the District, because the

(SRI A. P. APPANNA)

District authorities will not be in a position to know certain problems of the District when they are posted to that District. Then there is a suggestion, as a measure of economy, that the number of existing districts must be reduced and that there may be about 15 or 16 districts. In this respect, I beg to differ from the suggestion of the Resources Committee. I feel that if a District is smaller in size, the administration will be better. We had the experience in Coorg, before the merger and after the merger, that the administration could go on well because the District was small.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—Is it your opinion that all the Districts should be as Coorg or do you suggest any via media—bigger than Coorg and smaller than Bangalore?

**Sri A. P. APPANNA.**—I feel that all Districts should be as small as Coorg, because if the unit of administration is small, then there will be better administration. It is also suggested in the Report that the optimum size of a future District may be 5,000 square miles with a population of a million and a half on an average.

**Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).**—So according to the population, work load and area, we will have 50 districts in our State.

**Sri A. P. APPANNA.**—As a member from Coorg District, I apprehend that there is a great danger in this suggestion of the Committee.

**Sri G. V. GOWDA.**—Is it not a question of tagging on Coorg to another District or some other parts of other Districts being tagged on to Coorg?

**Sri A. P. APPANNA.**—I am not very particular that either Coorg must be the Headquarters or not. I feel that if the District is small, the administration will be better. Also, I would like to bring to the notice of the member that certain safeguards have been provided in the States Reorganisation Committee for Coorg to be retained as a District after merger and I hope that the Government will bear this in mind when a decision is taken regarding the Re-organisation of Districts.

There are various measures regarding the taxes and I would like to make one suggestion regarding the land revenue. The settlement is overdue in various parts of the State. In South Kanara and Coorg, they are paying higher land revenue, *i.e.* more than what is prevailing in old Mysore areas. This anomaly must be removed and it is suggested that resettlement is possible within one year in the whole of the State, and this must be brought into effect as early as possible.

**†Sri S. M. KRISHNA.**—Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I take the opportunity of congratulating the Committee headed by Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao, which has made a very distinguishing report on the ways and means of economy and finding resources to work the Third Five Year Plan.

I would also like to congratulate you, Sir, who was one of the distinguished members of this committee and the report also bears out that your guidance and your participation has added considerably to make this report a wholesome one.

Plenty of suggestions have been made in this report suggestions to augment the resources of this State to work the Third Five-Year Plan. We have said before that there is vast scope for implementing these suggestions at various levels of Governmental machinery and at various stages also. It has always been said that at least in Mysore State committees have been appointed before and committee have made reports before, but none of the reports submitted so far have been adequately implemented to either augment the resources or to bring in economy in governmental expenditure. I have in view various reports. One is the report submitted by Sri. A. D. Gorwala between 1957 and 1958 and even prior to that in 1956 there is the report of the Mysore Finance Enquiry Committee. Both the reports have made constructive suggestions to the Government not only to bring about certain economy but also to set the governmental machinery at work efficiently, quickly and smoothly. In this connection, I would only quote a

sentence from the report submitted by Sri. A. D. Gorwala. Even at the stage of introduction he says :

"It is not the sentiments of men which make history but their actions. So too Government is made good or bad not by the words but by the deeds or mis-deeds of those in power."

Just now, one of the very responsible members of the ruling party supported a recommendation made by this committee that only a Cabinet consisting of eight members would suffice to run the administration of this State. We have said so much about this Ministry and its expansion. It is beyond me to make any more criticisms of the Ministry on that particular score. But the reason why I am pointing out this is that the Ministry-makers and the political party which to day has the responsibility of guiding the destinies of the men and women of this State have to bear in mind some of these factors. And certainly it does not bring credit to the men and women who were responsible for bringing out this report that even while the report was before the Assembly, the Ministry was expanded beyond imagination.

The Leader of the Opposition the other day pointed out to the enormous delay that was found in almost all stages of governmental work. It is shocking that a petition takes about 242 days to be answered in the negative. I think the delay is inexcusable. Any administration if it is to make a profound impact and any administration which has as its ultimate objective the service of the people who are the masters must set right such delays. the delay not only in disposing of papers but also the delay in taking certain vital decisions. This aspect of the matter has been touched by both the reports viz. the Resources and Economy Committee Report and the Gorwala Committee Report. There are certain instances where the Ministry as a whole has been unable to come to certain decisions. In certain cases, the lower ranks of Government have been unable to come to certain decisions. All these are matters which

should be an eye-opener to those who are in authority.

The other day, Sri. Anna Rao while speaking on the report echoed the sentiments of everyone in this House when he said that in respect of the monies that the Government is spending on various projects, both plan as well as non-plan items, there should be a separate and independent agency to judge whether the monies that have been sanctioned in this House have been spent with the interest of the State at heart. In this connection, I would only quote what the committee has to say on this matter.

"What is really required is a high-level performance audit of achievements under the plan related to costs and results to be carried out by an independent expert organisation. We suggest this because at present all the three functions i.e. policy making, execution and evaluation of the plans are centred in the same agency, the Government which, being both the Prosecutor and the Judge, cannot be expected to take an objective view of its performance."

The suggestion sounds logical and reasonable. Today, we are faced with a situation wherein so many of these projects which are supposed to change the destinies of the common man of those regions have been undertaken but we have not been able to effectively assess their success or failure. We are told by a report submitted either to this House or to the Government by these agencies that in the fiscal year 1962-63 so much amount will be spent on a particular project. As an example, we can take the Sharavathy Project. For that project, the Government has allotted certain funds for being spent by the Sharavathy Project Authorities in a particular year. But we are again told by the Government that money is spent in 1962-63. But what we, as representatives of the people, are interested in is whether the money so allotted for 1962-63 has been able to attain the targets which the authorities have fixed for 1962-63. Many a time on the floor of the House

(SRI S. M. KRISHNA)

we have heard criticisms that the Sharavathy Valley Project has been delayed. Here it is a question of time which is the most important factor involved in all such projects.

The report at one stage points out that in the year 1953 or 1954 the same project would have cost a few crores of rupees less. So, time makes a big difference in all these projects. We have been told first that in 1962 Sharavathi was to have been completed. Now, we are told that the first stage of Sharavathi will be completed in 1963. When I talked to the Contractor, Sir, I learnt that even in 1963, the first stage of Sharavathi Valley Project is not going to be completed. Sir, we have got to take these factors into consideration and we have to fix the responsibility on somebody. Either the Government ought to be responsible if the Progress of Sharavathi Valley Project is slowed. I think somebody ought to be held responsible. Well, the reasons are there, the weather factor is there, the question of finance is there. I agree with all that. Never the less, I think somebody ought to be accountable to the time table of the project. If any plan cannot be executed or cannot be implemented or cannot be implemented within a period stipulated at the time when we planned, then I feel Sir that plan is bad planning, and that plan is no planning at all. When we plan a big project like Sharavathi, Malaprabha or Ghataprabha, I think the Engineers and experts will have to fore see the difficulties, they will have to foresee the insurmountable difficulties. I think there is no end for our imagination. So, any plan should be able to cope with all the difficulties that might arise in the course of the implementation of the project. The Committee at one stage points out that in many of these projects, the Engineers or the experts or even the State Planning Committee or the State Planning Organisation has not been able to comprehend the difficulties that arise. To that extent, Sir, I am constrained to remark that it is an apology for planning, let alone

planning. I think the Government will have to bestow its consideration or thoughts to certain of these matters. Sir, the Committee also says that there has been considerable centralisation of power. It is a talk of panchayat raj; it is a slogan to whip up the enthusiasm of the rural folk, but I am afraid that it has remained a slogan. Recently, the Minister in charge at the Centre has certain unpalatable things to say about the way in which Panchayat raj has been functioning in our State. I will not take the trouble of quoting all that the Central Minister said on one occasion. But suffice for me to point out to this House and to the Government that the whole idea of decentralisation is a myth and it is just a smokescreen. There has not been decentralisation even in a limited sphere. For example, the idea of Cabinet system of Government does not conceive that the Ministers have got to attend even to every minutest detail. I think broadly speaking, it is the function of the Minister to lay down broad policy statements or policies and then co-ordinate all the departments that are within his sway and then see that certain policies are effectively implemented in his own Departments. But today, Sir, what is the pattern that we are seeing? The pattern is that when you go to any Minister, the Minister will be submerged with lots of files in his office. For every blessed thing, the Minister will have to affix his signature. I think much of the time of the Minister who has got to do certain creative thinking who has got to think deep about problems with a view to finding out solutions to these problems, is spent in these things. Today it so happens that the Minister is not only the person who enunciates policy, but he is also supposed to be the person who implements the policies also. I think we have basically a wrong concept of the functions of a Minister in a parliamentary system of Government. It is not that. Our Ministers are not aware of these factors. But nevertheless, even if they are aware, under the present framework of the Government, the Ministers have not been able to

bestow enough thoughts on problems. I think it would be in the best interests of the State that the Ministers should give a bold lead. There are a number of Secretaries attached to various Departments. There are a number of departmental heads attached to various departments. I think the responsibility will have to be fixed on the Secretaries of the Departments and Heads of the Departments whose duty it will be to implement the policy decisions given by the Ministers. It has also come to our notice.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—Do you want that more power must be given to Secretaries?

**Sri S. M. KRISHNA.**—I really do not mean that more powers will have to be given to the Secretaries. The point that I am driving home is this; that today most of the time of the Ministers is spent not only in formulating policies but also in trying to implement these policies. While speaking generally or theoretically, the ultimate responsibility will have to be fixed on the Minister. If the policy fails, it is the Minister who will be ultimately responsible. But today as it is in the present framework, the Secretary does not have any responsibility at all. If you ask any Secretary to Government he will have a sign look to the Minister'. I think that is belittling him.

**Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.**—To know his mind.

**Sri S. M. KRISHNA.**—Exactly to know the mind of the Minister. I do not think the originators of Cabinet Form of Government ever thought of knowing the minds of the Minister. What is that mind? Is it public mind or private mind? That is the distinction we will have to draw. Any way the responsibility of the Secretary should be fixed and the Secretary ultimately will have to be a little more active. Today, as it is the Secretaries are all passive. That is on account of the fact that the Minister has absorbed all the duties and responsibilities. So, to that extent, the Secretary has been

today ineffective. Even that office itself has become ornamental so to say. So, the Ministers will have to delegate certain of these powers to the Departmental Secretaries so that they could really feel that they are responsible for the implementation of certain of these policies laid out. Sir, now I come to the burning question of the tours conducted by the Ministers. At one stage, the report points out that about Rs. 138 lakhs are being spent on travelling allowance.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member may verify at his leisure about the accuracy of the figures. Now the House will rise for lunch and meet after half an hour.

— — —

*The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.*

— — —

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

### Chair's Ruling *re* : making Policy Statements to the Press when the House is in Session.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—On 10th September 1962, the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon'ble member Sri S. Shivappa referred to a meeting of the pressmen by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, a report of which had appeared in some of the newspapers. He objected to certain statements made by the Hon'ble Chief Minister to the pressmen at that meeting on the ground that when the House was in session any important pronouncement relating to the affairs of the State should be first made in the House and not outside to the Press. He alleged that this amounted to a breach of privilege as the first right of disclosure was to the House with regard to any policy statements. After the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition raised this point, a few other Hon'ble members